

Jun 06 05 04:03p Clairvoyante Inc

408 2002688

P.5

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 06 2005

EXAMINING GROUP 2676

PATENT

Customer No. 42304

Attorney Docket No. 0510068

Confirmation No. 1598

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Candice Hellen Brown Elliott et al.

Group Art Unit: 2676

Application No.: 10/821,388


Examiner: Rahmjoo, Manueller

Filed: April 9, 2004

For: SUBPIXEL RENDERING FILTERS  
FOR HIGH BRIGHTNESS  
SUBPIXEL LAYOUTSCommissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the USPTO on the following date: June 6, 2005

Carolyn Marsden  
Printed Name  
Signature

Sir:

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT UNDER 35 USC 1.1**

Applicant files herewith a Response to the Restriction Requirement contained in an Office Action mailed April 11, 2005.

The Examiner posits that there are twelve (12) patentably distinct species of the claimed invention contained in the present application:

Jun 06 05 04:04p

Clairvoyante Inc

408 2002688

P. 6

Appl. No. 10/243,094  
Amdt. Dated November 29, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of November 23, 2004

- I. Species 1 corresponding to figure 1;
- II. Species 2 corresponding to figure 2;
- III. Species 3 corresponding to figure 3a;
- IV. Species 4 corresponding to figure 3b;
- V. Species 5 corresponding to figure 4;
- VI. Species 6 corresponding to figure 5a;
- VII. Species 7 corresponding to figure 5b;
- VIII. Species 8 corresponding to figure 6;
- IX. Species 9 corresponding to figure 7;
- X. Species 10 corresponding to figure 8;
- XI. Species 11 corresponding to figure 9;
- XII. Species 12 corresponding to figure 15;

The Examiner states that the Applicant is required under 35 USC 101 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, the Examiner avers that there are no generic claims.

Further, the Examiner states that the Applicant must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Jun 06 05 04:04p

Clairvoyante Inc

408 2002688

p. 7

Appl. No. 10/243,094  
Amdt. Dated November 29, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of November 23, 2004

Furthermore, the Examiner states that should Applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, Applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case.

Applicant respectfully traverses the identification of species as provided by the Examiner for the following reasons:

1) Claims 1 -14, as submitted, have one independent Claim -- namely, Claim 1. Claim 1 is drawn to a method for rendering image data on a display wherein the display comprises a repeating group of subpixels. This repeating group substantially comprises of at least one white subpixel and a plurality of colored subpixels.

2) Figures 1, 2, 3a, 3b, 5a, 5b, 7 and 8 -- as may be seen -- meet the claim limitation above of a subpixel repeating group substantially comprising a white subpixel and a plurality of colored subpixels.

3) Figures 4, 6, 9 and 15 are figures that are embodiments of filter kernels and resample areas that are subsumed under the scope of Claim 1 -- hence, all of the dependent claims.

As such, Applicant respectfully avers that Claim 1 is generic to all of the noted species listed by the Examiner.

Appl. No. 10/243,094  
Amdt. Dated November 29, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of November 23, 2004

Heeding the Examiner's admonition, however, that no response is complete without an election of a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits, Applicant hereby selects Species 7. As such, Applicant identifies Claims 1-14 as applying to Species 7.

However, Applicant would appreciate the Examiner to remain as to Applicant's traversal stated herein. Applicant believes that the method claim of Claim 1 encompasses all layouts comprising a repeating subpixel grouping further substantially comprising of at least one white subpixel and a plurality of colored subpixels.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite the allowance of the claims, the Examiner is invited to contact Stuart P. Kaler at (707) 824-2487.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6 June 2005

By: Stuart P. Kaler

Stuart P. Kaler  
Reg. No. 35, 913